



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,276	07/08/2003	Frank Olschewski	21295-61	1275
29127	7590	08/22/2007		
HOUSTON ELISEEVA 4 MILITIA DRIVE, SUITE 4 LEXINGTON, MA 02421			EXAMINER KIM, CHONG R	
			ART UNIT 2624	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/22/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment and Arguments***

1. Applicant's amendment filed on June 5, 2007 has been entered and made of record.
2. In view of Applicant's amendment, the rejection under 35 USC 101 is withdrawn.
3. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but they are not deemed to be persuasive for at least the following reasons.

Applicant argues (page 5) that their claimed invention (claims 1-12) differs from the prior art because Elings does not disclose a non-scanning actuator. The Examiner disagrees. Elings clearly explains that the actuators are "independent of the raster scan or other positioning of the tip and can be a constant motion or may vary with time." [col. 4, lines 13-17]. Because Elings's actuators are completely independent from the scanning process, Examiner construes such actuators to be non-scanning actuators.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1 – 9, 11, and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Elings (5,077,473).

Art Unit: 2624

In regards to claim 6, An arrangement for monitoring and controlling a microscope, comprising: a detector unit for acquiring at least one image, at least one input port for a control variable (Figure 2, shows that many ports go into the scanner, 14, those ports include control variables 24, 26, and 22 which control the positioning of the device), a computer system associated with the microscope (Figure 2, item 18), wherein the information content of the at least one image can be ascertained using the detector unit and the computer system (col. 7, lines 10 – 37: The scanning microscope acquires images, which are then analyzed.); the computer system analyzes the information content using a specified target information content and a specified variation of the information content as the tolerance dimension, and determines a control variable therefrom (col. 8, line 54 – col.10, line 65: The system tracks drift motion, using the information obtained from the image, it checks for motion within a particular tolerance level, and warns the user if the motion goes beyond that point.); from the analysis of the information content, using a predetermined target value for influencing the information content (col. 8, line 54 – col.10, line 65: The system attempts to keep the image stationary, by sending control signals to the actuators.); and at least one non-scanning actuator (30) associated with the microscope, wherein the actuator converts the control variable allocated to the actuator into a change in the information content of the image within a tolerance dimension (col. 4, lines 13-18 and col. 7, lines 17-21. Note that actuator 30 can be used independently from the scan generator 28).

In regards to claim 7, The arrangement as defined in claim 6, wherein a means for outputting a warning signal is provided, which means makes a warning signal available to the user if the variations in the information content lie outside the tolerance dimension (Col. 10, lines 20 – 65).

Art Unit: 2624

In regards to claim 8, The arrangement as defined in claim 6, wherein several non-scanning actuators (30) are associated with the microscope, each of which receives a different control variable (Figure 2).

In regards to claim 9, The arrangement as defined in claim 6, wherein a switch is provided with which a user initiates the automatic monitoring of the microscope (col. 8, lines 4 – 28: The operator initiates the operation by selecting the initial image. A switch could constitute any means the operator uses to indicate he or she is satisfied with the current image.).

In regards to claim 11, The arrangement as defined in claim 6, wherein the microscope is embodied as a scanning microscope (col. 7, line 11).

In regards to claim 1, claim 1 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7. The argument analogous to that presented above for claim 7 is applicable to claim 1.

In regards to claim 2, claim 2 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 8. The argument analogous to that presented above for claim 8 is applicable to claim 2.

In regards to claim 3, claim 3 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 9. The argument analogous to that presented above for claim 9 is applicable to claim 3.

In regards to claim 4, claim 4 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 9. The argument analogous to that presented above for claim 9 is applicable to claim 4.

In regards to claim 5, claim 5 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 11. The argument analogous to that presented above for claim 11 is applicable to claim 5.

In regards to claim 12, claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1. The argument analogous to that presented above for claim 1 is applicable to claim 12.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elings in view of Tsuneta (6,570,156).

In regards to claim 10, Elings discloses the concept of allowing the user to turn on the feature. Elings also teaches (col. 7, lines 39 – 53) that the system can be implemented in software. It is well known to use GUIs for users to control actions on a computers system. A GUI was probably what Elings was referring to for the user controls specified throughout the patent, but as Elings does not explicitly state this, a secondary teaching has been provided. Tsuneta teaches (Figure 2) that a GUI can be used to control a microscope and alert the user to problems.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a GUI for user interaction in Elings as taught by Tsuneta. A GUI would allow for easy to understand controls that could also communicate errors to the user. GUIs are familiar interfaces for most computer users and would require very little training in the actual use of the interface.

Art Unit: 2624

***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-7421. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon thru Thurs 8:30am to 6pm and alternating Fri 9:30am to 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on 571-272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-8300.



Art Unit: 2624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Charles Kim  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2624  
[chongr.kim@uspto.gov](mailto:chongr.kim@uspto.gov)



BHAVESH M. MEHTA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

August 13, 2007